

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 remain pending in the application.

**Claims 1-31 over Alam in view of Feague**

In the Office Action, claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,324,544 to Alam et al. ("Alam") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,247,135 to Feague ("Feague"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-31 recite a system and method relying on a synchronization instruction comprising a command for synchronizing information between a personal data assistant and a host device/remote computer **and** a command to pass control to a particular application after synchronization.

Alam discloses synchronization components to synchronize objects on a first and second computing device (see Abstract). A synchronization manager manipulates a reference store to maintain a mapping between instances of object stores on a desktop and instances of the same objects stored in object stores on a mobile device (see col. 10, lines 53-57). A list of handles are maintained in the reference store to determine which items need to be synchronized to the mobile device (see Alam, col. 11, lines 6-9). The synchronization manager determines which objects have been added, deleted or updated since the last synchronization operation (see Alam, col. 11, lines 10-13; col. 12, lines 15-17 and lines 34-47).

Alam discloses synchronization between a first and second computing device through a reference store that designates which items to synchronize. Alam fails to disclose his reference store provides any commands other than those needed to perform synchronization between the first and second computing devices. Alam fails to disclose a synchronization instruction comprising two different types of commands, i.e., a command for synchronizing information between a personal data assistant **and** a host device/remote computer and a command to pass control to a particular application after synchronization, as recited by claims 1-31.

Feague discloses a methodology of negotiating between two or more devices exactly what synchronization process (protocol) is to be employed to effect synchronization of the devices (see Abstract). Either content-oriented or record-oriented synchronization for data sets is performed (see col. 7, lines 10-49).

Thus, Feague discloses, like Alam, commands for performing synchronization. However, Feague, like Alam, fails to disclose any commands other than those needed to perform synchronization between two or more devices. Alam fails to disclose, teach or suggest a synchronization instruction comprising a command for synchronizing information between a personal data assistant **and** a host device/remote computer and a command to pass control to a particular application after synchronization, as recited by claims 1-31.

Alam in view of Feague, either alone or in combination, still fails to disclose, teach or suggest a synchronization instruction comprising a command for synchronizing information between a personal data assistant and a host device/remote computer **and** a command to pass control to a particular application after synchronization, as recited by claims 1-31.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claims 1-31. Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-31 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William H. Bollman", written over a horizontal line.

William H. Bollman

Reg. No.: 36,457

Tel. (202) 261-1020

Fax. (202) 887-0336

**MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC**

2000 M Street, NW 7<sup>TH</sup> Floor

Washington, DC 20036-3307

TEL. (202) 261-1020

FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df